	Case 2:05-cv-00417-JAM-CHS Document 15 Filed 06/03/05 Page 1 of 1
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	BEE YANG, CIV S-05-0417 DFL DAD P
11	Petitioner, ORDER
12	v.
13	CATHY MENDOZA-POWERS,
14	Respondent.
15	
16	On June 1, 2005, respondent filed a request for a three-day enlargement of time in
17	which to file a response to petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus. Subsequently on June 2,
18	2005, respondent filed a motion to dismiss and documents in support of the motion. GOOD CAUSE
19	APPEARING, respondent is granted an enlargement of time nunc pro tune, and the motion to
2021	dismiss is deemed timely filed. Petitioner shall file his opposition or statement of non-opposition to the motion to dismiss within thirty days of service of the motion. Respondent's reply, if any, shall
22	be filed within fifteen days thereafter.
23	DATED: June 3, 2005.
24	<u> </u>
25	Dale A. Dayd DALE A. DROZD
26	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27	DAD:4
28	yang0417.eot2